

Case 7:16-cv-00279-JPJ-RSB Document 3 Filed 06/25/16 Page 1 of 2 Pageid#: 30

Howard's current custodian. Therefore, I have no jurisdiction to address Howard's claims under § 2241.

I also cannot find that the interests of justice warrant transfer of the petition to the appropriate federal court in Kansas. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). Howard's claims, challenging the validity of his underlying conviction, may be addressed under § 2241 only under certain circumstances not present here. *See, e.g., In re Jones*, 226 F.3d 328, 333-34 (4th Cir. 2000) (finding § 2241 challenge to federal conviction barred absent showing of post-conviction change in law making petitioner's offense conduct no longer criminal).

For the stated reasons, I will summarily dismiss Howard's petition for lack of jurisdiction, without prejudice to his submission of an adequate § 2241 petition in the appropriate court.¹

A separate Final Order will be entered herewith.

DATED: June 25, 2016

/s/ James P. Jones
United States District Judge

¹ In a separate motion submitted with his petition here, Howard also asserts an unspecified claim under *Johnson v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (June 26, 2015). Because Howard is not confined in this district, I have no jurisdiction to address any § 2241 claim he may have under *Johnson*. Similarly, I have no jurisdiction to construe and address his letter as presenting such a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Howard previously filed a § 2255 motion challenging this court's Judgment in No. 7:08CR00023. Therefore, any present claim under § 2255 involving that Judgment is successive and barred from review absent certification from the court of appeals. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h).